```
Traeger Machetanz, Esq.
      1
           Thomas R. Krider, Esq.
           OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER, LLP
      2
           745 Fourth Avenue, Suite 502
      3
           Anchorage, AK 99501-2136
           Telephone: (907) 258-0106
      4
           Telecopier: (907) 258-5519
      5
           Attorneys for Nugget Construction Co., Inc.,
           and USF&G, Defendants
      6
                               IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      7
                             FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA AT ANCHORAGE
      8
           UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the
           use of NORTH STAR TERMINAL &
      9
           STEVEDORE COMPANY, d/b/a NORTHERN
           STEVEDORING & HANDLING, and NORTH
                                                          No. A98-009 CIV (TMB)
     10
           STAR TERMINAL & STEVEDORE COMPANY,
           d/b/a Northern Stevedoring &
     11
           Handling, on its own behalf,
     12
                             Plaintiffs,
                 and
                                                           NUGGET CONSTRUCTION,
     13
                                                           INC.'S AND UNITED STATES
           UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the
                                                           FIDELITY & GUARANTY
     14
                                                           CO., INC.'S MOTION FOR
           use of SHORESIDE PETROLEUM, INC.,
           d/b/a Marathon Fuel Service, and
                                                           RECONSIDERATION OF THE
     15
           SHORESIDE PETROLEUM, INC., d/b/a
                                                           COURT'S JULY 28, 2006
                                                           ORDER AND MEMORANDUM IN
           Marathon Fuel Service, on its own
     16
                                                           SUPPORT THEREOF
           behalf,
     17
                       Intervening Plaintiffs,
                 and
     18
           METCO, INC.,
     19
 Fax: (907) 258-5519
                       Intervening Plaintiff,
     20
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2136
(907) 258-0106 Fax: (907) 258
                 vs.
     21
           NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.; SPENCER
     22
           ROCK PRODUCTS, INC.; UNITED
           STATES FIDELITY AND GUARANTY
     23
           COMPANY; and ROBERT A. LAPORE,
     24
                             Defendants.
     25
  lel:
```

OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP

745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 502

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Pursuant to Rule 59.1 of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the District of Alaska and pursuant to the Court's inherent powers, Defendant Nugget Construction, Inc. ("Nugget") and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company ("USF&G") move for partial reconsideration of the Court's July 28, 2006 Order ("Order"). Specifically, Nugget and USF&G respectfully move the Court to reconsider the part of its Order denying Nugget's and USF&G's motion for summary judgment on North Star Terminal and Stevedore Company's ("North Star") and Shoreside Petroleum, Inc.'s ("Shoreside") (collectively, "plaintiffs") claims based on the existence of an express contract between Nugget and plaintiffs. For the reasons discussed below, the undisputed facts establish that there could not be an express contract, by agency or otherwise, between Nugget and either North Star or Shoreside.

## Discussion

Reconsideration of a court's findings on summary judgment is appropriate if, inter alia, a "court overlooks material facts that were presented to it before it made its decision." 1 Here, the Court has overlooked the material fact that neither North Star nor Shoreside has ever alleged the facts or evidence necessary to sustain their

 $<sup>^{</sup>m 1}$  Wescott v. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2005 WL 2704985 (Slip Copy, Oct. 11, 2005) at \*1; see also Certain Underwriters at Lloyds, London v. Inlet Fisheries, Inc., 2006 WL 463877 (Slip Copy, Feb. 24, 2006) at \*1 and n. 5 ("[r]econsideration [of grant of summary judgment is appropriate if the district court . . . committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust").

U.S. ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al. Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH) Memorandum in Support of Nugget Construction, Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration -- Page 1 of 7

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

claims based on express contract, by agency or otherwise. 2 This constitutes clear error. Further, manifest injustice will result if Nugget is forced incur the needless but considerable time and expense of proving this fact at trial.

In its July 28, 2006 Order, the Court reasoned that "the viability of Plaintiffs express contract claim against Nugget depends upon Nugget's relationship with Spencer," and thus concludes: "Here, material facts necessary to determine the existence of an agency relationship, namely the extent to which Nugget assumed control over Spencer, are in dispute." Order at 6, 7-8. Respectfully, there could not be an express contract by agency between Nugget and either North Star or Shoreside because these plaintiffs entered into their express contracts with Spencer Rock Products, Inc. ("Spencer") long before any agency relationship between Nugget and Spencer allegedly arose and, notably, before the execution of the Support Agreement between Nugget and Spencer, on which both North Star and Shoreside so significantly rely in support of their claims that an express contract by agency existed between Nugget and plaintiffs.

Significantly, it is undisputed that Spencer approached Shoreside regarding work on the Homer Spit project in the winter of 1996-97 and then purchased services from Shoreside pursuant to an express written

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  As the Court observed in its July 28, 2006 Order, the Ninth Circuit previously held that Nugget never entered into express contracts with either North Star or Shoreside. See Order at 6.

U.S. ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al. Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH) Memorandum in Support of Nugget Construction, Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration -- Page 2 of 7

credit agreement between Spencer and Shoreside that was executed on April 25, 1995.<sup>3</sup> It is similarly undisputed that North Star's services in connection with the Homer Spit Project were provided pursuant to an express written credit agreement that was executed on or about January 28, 1997.<sup>4</sup> Finally, neither North Star nor Shoreside dispute that the Support Agreement was executed on April 23, 1997.<sup>5</sup> As is argued throughout North Star's and Shoreside's briefing papers, the Support Agreement is the factual and legal foundation for its claim that Spencer was coerced into becoming an agent of Nugget.

As the Court instructed, "in order for an agency relationship to exist, an agent must have a power to alter the legal relations between the principal and third parties. The principal, in turn, must have the right to control the conduct of the agent with respect to the matters entrusted to him." Manes v. Coats, 941 P.2d 120, 123 (Alaska 1997). Further, "[u]nder Alaska law, an agency relation exists only if there has been a manifestation of the principal to the agent that the agent may act on his account and consent by the agent to so act." Harris v. Keys, 948 P.2d 460, 464 (Alaska 1997).

Neither North Star nor Shoreside has ever alleged that there existed an agency relationship between Nugget and Spencer prior to the

 $<sup>^3</sup>$  <u>See</u> Memorandum In Support of Nugget Construction, Inc.'s and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Co., Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment Against Shoreside Petroleum, Inc., Docket No. 481, at 10, ¶ 9, 11, ¶ 12.

 $<sup>^4</sup>$  <u>See</u> Memorandum In Support of Nugget Construction, Inc.'s and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Co., Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment Against North Star Terminal & Stevedore Co., Docket No. 489, at 10,  $\P$  10.

U.S. ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al. Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH)

Memorandum in Support of Nugget Construction,
Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration -- Page 3 of 7

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

execution of the Support Agreement. Indeed, there is neither allegation, nor evidence, nor fact (much less material fact) in the record that there was, or could have been, an agency relationship between Nugget and Spencer at the time plaintiffs were engaged by Spencer to work on the Homer Spit project or the time that plaintiffs executed their credit agreements, i.e., their express contracts, with Spencer. In the case of North Star, North Star's engagement by Spencer to provide services to the Homer Spit project was coincident with the express credit agreement between North Star and Spencer executed on or about January 28, 1997, approximately three months before the execution of the April 27, 1997 Support Agreement. Even if North Star were correct that the Support Agreement constitutes evidence of an agency relationship between Nugget and North Star, which it does not, this undisputed chronology of events cannot substantiate a finding that the Support Agreement constitutes "a manifestation of the principal [Nugget] to the agent [Spencer] that the agent may act on his account and consent by the agent to so act." Harris, 948 P.2d at 464. Such a finding is necessary to North Star's express contract by agency claim and, without such finding, North Star's express contract claim must fail.

Similarly, Shoreside was engaged by oral agreement with Spencer to work on the Homer Spit project in the winter of 1996-97. This engagement was governed by an express contract between Spencer and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See, e.g., id. at 8, ¶ 4. U.S. ex iel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al. Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH) Memorandum in Support of Nugget Construction, Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration -- Page 4 of 7

Shoreside that was executed on April 25, 1995, or approximately two years before the execution of the Support Agreement, and long before Nugget was awarded the contract for the Homer Spit Project, which occurred on or about September 28, 1996. There is not a single fact in the record to support the conclusion that Spencer was acting on Nugget's account when Spencer and Shoreside executed their express contract. See id.

## Conclusion

Because both North Star and Shoreside entered into their express contracts with Spencer before Spencer allegedly became an agent of Nugget, there could not have been, and cannot now be, as a matter of fact or law, an express contract between Nugget and North Star or Nugget and Shoreside. Accordingly, Nugget and USF&G respectfully request that the Court reconsider and reverse its July 28, 2006 finding and grant Nugget's and USF&G's motion for summary judgment seeking dismissal North Star's and Shoreside's express contract and express contract by agency claims.

 $<sup>^6</sup>$  See Memorandum In Support of Nugget Construction, Inc.'s and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Co., Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment Against Shoreside Petroleum, Inc., Docket No. 481, at 7,  $\P$  1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Dismissal of plaintiffs' express contract claims will not affect plaintiffs' ability to pursue remedies based on implied-in-fact contract as permitted by federal or Alaska state law. Notably, the federal common law "strawman" remedy under the Miller Act is based upon notions of implied-in-fact contract theory. This is quite different from the factually incongruous express contract by agency theory that plaintiffs now attempt to impose upon the Court.

U.S. ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al. Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH)

Memorandum in Support of Nugget Construction,
Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration -- Page 5 of 7

Dated:	August	2,	2006
Dateu.	August	Ζ,	2000

OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP Attorneys for Nugget Construction, Inc., and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Co.

## By: s/Thomas R. Krider

Fax:

Thomas R. Krider

<u>krider@oles.com</u>

Washington Bar No. 29490

745 West 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 502

Anchorage, AK 99501

Phone: (907) 258-0106

(907) 258-5519

U.S. ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al. Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH) Memorandum in Support of Nugget Construction, Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration -- Page 6 of 7

OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLI	745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 502	Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2136	Fax: (907) 258-5519
OLES MORRISON R	745 West Fourth	Anchorage, Ala	Tel: (907) 258-0106

CERTIFICATE	OF	SERVICE
CHILITICATE	OT.	

Ι	herek	ЭΥ	cert	ify	tha	at o	on	th	is	2nd
da	ay of	Αι	ıgust	2, 2	006	, a	tr	ue	an	d
CC	rrect		copy	of	the	for	reg	oi	ng	was
se	rved	el	ecti	roni	cali	v.	νi	а	ECF	on

Michae	el W.	Sew	right,	Esq.
mws@bp	ok.com	m		
Burr,	Pease	e &	Kurtz	
810 N	Stree	et		
Anchor	rage,	ΑK	99501	

Ste	zen J.	Shar	mburek,	Esc	₫•
shar	nburek@	gci.	.net		
Law	Office	of	Steven	J.	Shamburek
425	G Stre	et,	Suite	630	
Anch	norage	ΔK	99501	-58	7.2

Paul	Stock	ler,	Esq.
			ol.com
1309	West	$16^{\rm th}$	Avenue
Ancho	orage,	ΑK	99501

Herbert A. Viergutz, Esq. barmar@gci.net
Barokas Martin & Tomlinson
1029 West Third, Suite 280
Anchorage, AK 99501

C. Patrick Stoll, Esq.

cps@hvslaw.com
Herrig Vogt & Stoll LLP
4210 Douglas Bay Blvd., Suite 100
Granite Bay, CA 95746-5902

OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP

```
By: s/Thomas R. Krider
```

P JAD Memo in Support of mtn for reconsideration 080206 99310.0002

U.S. ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al. Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH) Memorandum in Support of Nugget Construction, Inc.'s Motion for Reconsideration -- Page 7 of 7